SINGLE BENCH

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR (CHHATTISGARH)

WRIT PETITION NO. 5950 OF 2005

PETITIONER : N. L. Sarve Son of Shri Sukaluram Sarve, aged about 46 years, Posted as Lab Technician, in District Malaria Office, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (C.G.).

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through: the Secretary, Department of Health and Family Welfare, D.K.S. Bhawan, Mantralaya, Raipur (C.G.).

2. The District Malaria Officer, Composite Building, Room No. 22, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (C.G.).

3. Dr. S. K. Tiwari, Son of not known, aged about 57 years, District Malaria Officer, Composite Building, Room No. 22, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (C.G.).

P.R. No. 6085/05
Presented by Shri Bashakar Pandey
dated 25/11/05

RE-COPY
Noted
25/11/05
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS, CERTIORARI, PROHIBITION ETC.

SINGLE BENCH (9)

RT
Heard
A.K.G. 5/12/05

RESPONDENT NO.4 :- Ku. Hemnandini Singh,
Lab Technician, Posted in
Primary Health Centre, Narmadapur,
Mainpat, District Surguja (C.G.).

Arrangement Incorporated
the Hon'ble High Court's
Order dt- 3-12-05
5-12-05
Counsel for petitioners

(62)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

SINGLE BENCH : HON'BLE MR. SATISH K. AGNIHOTRI, J.

WRIT PETITION NO.5950 OF 2005

Petitioner : N.L.Sarve

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

Present : Mr. Bhaskar Payashi, counsel for the petitioner.
Mr. Utkarsh Verma, Deputy Government Advocate for the State/respondents No.1 and 2.
Mr. Sameer Behar, counsel for respondent No.3.
None appears for respondent No.4.

ORDER
(Passed on 28th Day of February, 2007)

The petitioner while working as Lab Technician in the office of District Malaria Officer, Bilaspur has been transferred to Primary Health Centre, Narmadapur, Mainpat, District Surguja, vide order dated 14-11-2005 (P-1). The petitioner impugns the order dated 14-11-2005 (P-1).

2. This Court, vide interim order dated 03-12-2005, granted stay of the impugned order dated 14-11-2005 (P-1) till the next date of hearing.

3. With the passage of time, the writ petition has become infructuous, to which learned counsel appearing for the State/respondents No.1 and 2 has no objection.

4. Thus, the writ petition is dismissed as having become infructuous. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Gopal